



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,987	01/21/2004	Joseph Broumand	O001.P001U1	4298
25854	7590	04/15/2009		
BRYAN W. BOCKHOP, ESQ. BOCKHOP & ASSOCIATES, LLC 2375 MOSSY BRANCH DR. SNIELVILLE, GA 30078			EXAMINER	
			AHMED, AFFAF	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3622	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/15/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/761,987	Applicant(s) BROUMAND, JOSEPH
	Examiner AFAF AHMED	Art Unit 3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2009.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2,3,7,9,11,13-18,27-33,68 and 69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1,4-6,8,10,12,19-26,41-67 and 70 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2,3,7,9,11,13-18,27-33,68 and 69 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No./Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No./Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 3622

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17 (e), was filed in this application after final rejection. since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17 (e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/25/2009 has been entered.
2. Claims 27, 32, 68 and 69 have been amended.
3. Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 10, 12, 19-26, 41-67 and 70 have been canceled.
4. Claims 2-3, 7, 9, 11, 13-18, 27-33, 68 and 69 are currently pending and have been examined.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

5. Applicant's amendment has corrected the minor informalities of claims 7, 27 and 69, and cancelled claim 70, therefore the objection is withdrawn.
6. Applicant has amended claims 27, 69 and 70; however, Applicant's amendment has failed to clarify what the objective factor is other than a number between 0 and 1 that indicates a quality of the user information. Therefore, the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C § 112 second paragraph is maintained.
7. Applicant's arguments filed on 02/25/2009 have been fully considered, but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
8. In response to Applicant's arguments with regard to Evidence of Secondary Considerations.
 - a. Objective evidence which must be factually supported by *an appropriate affidavit or declaration* (see MPEP 37 C.F.R § 1.132) to be of probative value includes evidence of unexpected results, commercial success, solution of a long-felt need, inoperability of the prior art, invention before the date of the reference, and allegations that the author(s) of the prior art derived the disclosed subject matter from the applicant. See, for example, *In re De Blauwe*, 736 F.2d 699, 705, 222 USPQ 191, 196 (Fed. Cir. 1984) ("It is well settled that unexpected results must be established by factual evidence (MPEP 716.01)."
 - b. To be given substantial weight in the determination of obviousness or nonobviousness, evidence of secondary considerations must be relevant to the subject matter as claimed, and therefore the examiner must determine whether there is a nexus between the merits of the claimed invention and the evidence of secondary considerations. *Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.*, 776 F.2d 281, 305 n.42, 227 USPQ 657, 673-674 n. 42 (Fed. Cir. 1985), cert. denied, 475 U.S. 1017 (1986). The term "nexus" designates a factually and legally sufficient connection between the objective evidence of nonobviousness and the claimed invention so that the evidence is of probative value in the determination of nonobviousness. *Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.*, 851 F.2d 1387, 7 USPQ2d 1222 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 488 U.S. 956 (1988) (MPEP 716.01).

c. Applicant is required to compare the commercial success to the claimed invention. For example applicant should indicate significant success rate when the limitation in the claims is used or applied. OR should indicated the success rate when compared to the conventional method. Personal opinion as to nexus is insufficient; there must be some evidence showing that the customer bought the device because of features of the claimed invention. Just because companies are interested in using the assign is not enough as showing a commercial success or long felt need.

d. Proof of commercial success, however, is not simply a matter of producing sales figures. Applicant must show evidence of market share, growth in market share, and replacement of earlier sales by others. Evidence of commercial success can be downgraded where there is no showing that the sales represent a substantial share of any definable market or that the profitability is anything out of the ordinary in the industry involved. Sales figures cannot be given controlling weight in determining the effect of commercial success where the patent owner was the market leader well before the introduction of the patented invention. Sponsorship by a market leader may be largely responsible for the success of the invention.

Claim Objections

9. Claims 13-17 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 13-17 are depending on canceled claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 27, 68 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

12. claims 27, 68 and 69 recites the limitation of: *billing the advertiser an amount that is determined by subtracting from a predetermined maximum bounty a product of the predetermined maximum bounty times at least one objective factor that indicates a quality of the user information, objective factor being a number between 0 and 1, that indicates a quality of the user information.* It is unclear what Applicant is referring to by *an objective factor, objective factor being a number between 0 and 1, that indicates a quality of the user information.* Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

13. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

14. Claims 27, 68 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Based on Supreme Court precedent and recent Federal Circuit decisions, a 35 U.S.C § 101 process must (1) be tied to a particular machine or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. In re Bilski et al, 88 USPQ 2d 1385 CAFC (2008); Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876).

15. An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the particular machine to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

16. Here, applicant's method steps are not tied to a particular machine and do not perform a transformation. Thus, the claims are non-statutory.

17. **Examiner's Note:** The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record within the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures .may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the entire reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3622

19. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

20. Claims 7, 9, 27, 68 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frengut et al, US Pub No: 2002/0046099 in view of Szabo, US Pat No: 6,868,525 B1 in view of Detrick US Pat No: 5,724,521.

Claims 27:

Frengut discloses:

- *receiving target information from a plurality of advertisers, the target information received from each advertiser setting forth a set of criteria that is to be used to select to which of the plurality of users each advertiser targets for on-line promotions* (see at least paragraphs 27, 45, 49 and 51);
- *presenting a registration window to a user of the plurality of users, the registration window including input fields that allow the user to input user information* (see at least paragraphs 28 and 30);
- *upon the user completing entry of the user information into the input fields of the registration window, comparing the user information associated with the user to the set of criteria associated with each advertiser* (see at least paragraphs 25 and 46);
- *presenting to the user an advertiser window that lists only each advertiser whose criteria are matched by the user information entered by the user; and receiving input from the user indicating which selected advertisers listed in the advertiser window the user desires information* (see at least paragraphs 26 and 39); and
- *upon receiving the input from the user, transmitting to each of the selected advertisers a set of the user information associated with the user* (see at least paragraph 56);

Frengut does not specifically disclose, but Szabo, however discloses:

- *billing the advertiser, for each user that has opted-in to receive information from the advertiser, an amount that is determined by subtracting from a predetermined maximum bounty a product of the predetermined maximum bounty times at least*

one objective factor that indicates a quality of the user information (see at least 28, lines 4-35);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Frengut's teaching method for providing customized user interface and targeted marketing forum to include Szabo's teaching of billing advertiser based on predicted consumer action using any mathematical formula with the motivation of optimizing the presentation of advertising to potential consumers and achieving a higher effectiveness of advertising as taught by Szabo (column 28, lines 4-6).

The combination of Frengut/Szabo does not specifically disclose, but Detrick however discloses:

- *an objective factor being a number between 0 and 1, that indicates a quality of the user information* (see at least column 5, lines 29-64 and column 6, lines 1-11);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Frengut's/Szabo method and apparatus for providing graphical user interface and targeted marketing forum with Dedrick's method and apparatus for providing electronic advertisements to end users in a consumer best-fit pricing manner with the motivation of providing advertisers with a method to reduce waste of time and money spent on disinterested or unqualified customers.

Claim 68:

Frengut discloses:

- *receiving target information from a plurality of advertisers, the target information received from each advertiser setting forth a set of criteria that is to be used to select to which of the plurality of users each advertiser targets for on-line promotions* (see at least paragraphs 27, 45, 49 and 51);
- *presenting a registration window to a user of the plurality of users, the registration window including input fields that allow the user to input user information* (see at least paragraphs 28 and 30);
- *upon the user completing entry of the user information into the input fields of the registration window, comparing the user information associated with the user to the set of criteria associated with each advertiser* (see at least paragraphs 25 and 46);

- *presenting to the user an advertiser window that lists only each advertiser whose criteria are matched by the user information entered by the user; and receiving input from the user indicating which selected advertisers listed in the advertiser window the user desires information (see at least paragraphs 26 and 39); and*
- *upon receiving the input from the user, transmitting to each of the selected advertisers a set of the user information associated with the user (see at least paragraph 56);*
- *determining when a user has opted-in to receiving information from the advertiser (see at least paragraphs 55 and 56);*

Frengut does not specifically disclose, but Szabo, however discloses:

- *billing the advertiser, for each user that has opted-in to receive information from the advertiser; an amount that is determined by subtracting from a predetermined maximum bounty a product of the predetermined maximum bounty times at least one objective factor that indicates a quality of the user information (see at least column 28, lines 4-35);*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Frengut's teaching method for providing customized user interface and targeted marketing forum to include Szabo's teaching of billing advertiser based on predicted consumer action using any mathematical formula with the motivation of optimizing the presentation of advertising to potential consumers and achieving a higher effectiveness of advertising as taught by Szabo (column 28, lines 4-6).

The combination of Frengut/Szabo does not specifically disclose, but Detrick however discloses:

- *an objective factor being a number between 0 and 1, that indicates a quality of the user information (see at least column 5, lines 29-64 and column 6, lines 1-11);*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Frengut's/Szabo method and apparatus for providing graphical user interface and targeted marketing forum with Dedrick's method and apparatus for providing electronic advertisements to end users in a consumer best-fit pricing manner with the motivation of providing advertisers with a method to reduce waste of time and money spent on disinterested or unqualified customers.

Claim 69:

Frengut discloses:

- *receiving from a Web server a subset of a set of user information received from a user who has responded to a registration of a Web page administered by the Web server, the subset of the set of information limited to information that is necessary to determine whether the user meets criteria set forth to the promoter an advertiser of the plurality of advertisers (see at least paragraphs 25 and 51);*
- *when the criteria are met by the user, then transmitting to the user an opt-in window that includes a data entry mechanism that allows the user to select the advertiser, thereby indicating that the user desires information about the advertiser (see at least paragraphs 26 and 39) ; and*
- *when the user selects the advertiser via the opt-in window, then transmitting to the advertiser the set of user information (see at least paragraphs 51 and 56);*

Frengut does not specifically disclose:

- *comparing the subset of information to the criteria set forth by the advertiser to determine the criteria of the advertiser are met by the user ;*
- *when the criteria are met by the user, then receiving from the Web server any information in the set of information not included in the subset of the set of information;*

Frengut in at least paragraph 47 discloses an advertising filtration host that allows for the cumulative effect of adding "qualifying filters" to create various levels of demographics and behaviors of the users that the advertiser wants to reach. The host narrows down the targeting consumers by adding the appropriate filter to exclude or include the specific qualifying or disqualifying variables provided by the advertiser.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Frengut's advertising filtration system based on "qualifying filters with a determination unit to compare the filters level with the advertiser's criteria and for matches to download the rest of the set of user information (criteria, etc) with the motivation of providing advertisers with better qualified leads.

Frengut does not specifically disclose, but Szabo, however discloses:

- *billing the advertiser, for each user that has opted-in to receive information from the advertiser; an amount that is determined by subtracting from a predetermined maximum bounty a product of the predetermined maximum*

bounty times at least one objective factor that indicates a quality of the user information (see at least 28, lines 4-35);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Frengut's teaching method for providing customized user interface and targeted marketing forum to include Szabo's teaching of billing advertiser based on predicted consumer action using any mathematical formula with the motivation of optimizing the presentation of advertising to potential consumers and achieving a higher effectiveness of advertising as taught by Szabo (column 28, lines 4-6).

The combination of Frengut/Szabo does not specifically disclose, but Detrick however discloses:

- *an objective factor being a number between 0 and 1, that indicates a quality of the user information* (see at least column 5, lines 29-64 and column 6, lines 1-11);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Frengut's/Szabo's method and apparatus for providing graphical user interface and targeted marketing forum with Dedrick's method and apparatus for providing electronic advertisements to end users in a consumer best-fit pricing manner with the motivation of providing advertisers with a method to reduce waste of time and money spent on disinterested or unqualified customers.

Claim 7

Frengut/ Szabo/Detrick disclose the limitations as shown above:

Frengut further discloses:

- *sending a confirmation e-mail to the user who has opted in at least selection* (see at least paragraph 40);

Claim 9:

Frengut/ Szabo/Detrick discloses the limitations as shown above.

With regard to the limitation of:

- *using a portion of the user information to retrieve additional user data from a record; and assembling the additional user data into user information;*

Frengut in at least paragraph 47 discloses an advertising filtration host that allows for the cumulative effect of adding "qualifying filters" to create various levels of demographics and behaviors of the users that the advertiser wants to reach. The host narrows down

the targeting consumers by adding the appropriate filter to exclude or include the specific qualifying or disqualifying variables provided by the advertiser.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Frengut's advertising filtration system based on "qualifying filters with a determination unit to compare the filters level with the advertiser's criteria and for matches to download the rest of the set of user information (criteria, etc) with the motivation of providing advertisers with better qualified leads.

21. Claims 2-3, 17-18 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frengut et al, US Pub No: 2002/0046099 in view of Szabo, US Pat No: 6,868,525 B1 in view of Detrick US Pat No: 5,724,521 in view of French et al US Pat No: 6,282,658 B2.

Claims 2-3, 17-18 and 32-33:

Frengut/ Szabo/Detrick discloses the limitations as shown above.

Frengut does not specifically disclose, but French however discloses:

- *comparing at least one item of the user information to at least one database to ensure that the item of the user information is valid prior to the action of transmitting the set of the user information; and*
- *when the item of the user information is not found in the at least one database then taking a predetermined action.*
- *wherein the item of user information comprises an item selected from a group consisting of: user's postal code, a user's telephone number, a user age, a user's e-mail address and combinations thereof,*

See at least column 7, lines 57-65, column 10, lines 51-65 and column 9, lines 27-28

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Frengut 's method and system for customized user interface and targeted marketing forum with French's method and system of verifications of user's identity when conducting an on-line transactions with the motivation of validating submitted user's information is correct.

Examiner Notes: claims 2, 17 and 32 recites the limitations of: when the item of the user information is not found in the at least one database then taking a predetermined action. *It has been held that Language that suggest or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation (MPEP §2106 II C).*

22. Claims 13-15 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frengut et al, US Pub No: 2002/0046099 in view of Szabo, US Pat No: 6,868,525 B1 in view of Detrick US Pat No: 5,724,521 in view of Brierley et al, Us Pub No: 2002/0161779 A1.

Claims 13-15 and 28-30:

Frengut/ Szabo/Detrick discloses the limitations as shown above.

Frengut does not specifically disclose, but Brierley however discloses:

- *wherein the at least one objective factor is a past performance indicator of a server hosting the web page* (see at least paragraphs 31 and 56);
- *wherein the at least one objective factor is an opt-in rate for similar promotions* (see at least paragraphs 31,56-57 and 79);
- *wherein the at least one objective factor is a confirmation e-mail open rate* (see at least paragraphs 6,38-39, 68 and fig 12 B with the associated text.;

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Frengut's system and method of identifying marketing forum with Brierley's method and system of for evaluating on-line promotions effectiveness with the motivation of maximizing the effectiveness of advertising campaign.

23. Claims 11 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frengut et al, US Pub No: 2002/0046099.

Claims 11 and 40:

Frengut/ Szabo/Detrick discloses the limitations as shown above.

Frengut does not specifically disclose:

- *determining that part of the user information is missing; and using statistical census data to complete the user information;*

However, Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in advertising art, when using consumers' demographic information to target advertisements, if one part of the demographic information is missing; advertiser is capable of obtaining the missing information form the census bureau. The U.S Census Bureau is used for obtaining missing information for research, business marketing, planning purposes and sampling survey.

For example, for a known geographical area (zip-code), if the average income is missing, an advertiser can obtain the average income for the specified geographical area from the U.S. Census Data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Frengut's method and system of customizing targeted

marketing forum with census data with the motivation of providing the most accurate and available consumers' information to advertisers.

24. Claims 16 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frengut et al, US Pub No: 2002/0046099 in view of Szabo, US Pat No: 6,868,525 B1 in view of Detrick US Pat No: 5,724,521 in view of Koningstein Us Pub No: 2005/0096979.

Claims 16 and 31:

Frengut/ Szabo/Detrick discloses the limitations as shown above.

Frengut does not specifically disclose, but Koningstein however discloses:

- *wherein the predetermined maximum bounty is a maximum bounty set by the advertiser* (see at least paragraphs 81 and 82);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Frengut's system and method of identifying marketing forum with Koningstein's method and system of enabling advertisements to follow user to next webpage with the motivation of allowing advertisers to set up a maximum budget through which advertisers are capable of providing effective and desirable advertisements to users.

Conclusion

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Affaf Ahmed whose telephone number is 571-270-1835. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 am-6:00 pm est, alt Fridays off.

26. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached at 571-272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AA

/Yehdega Retta/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3622

Application/Control Number: 10/761,987

Art Unit: 3622

Page 13